

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAR 22 2007****REMARKS**

Claims 49-50 are all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 49 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner has indicated that the last paragraph in each of claims 49 and 50 is unclear. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have hereby amended the last paragraph of claims 49 and 50 so as to clarify the feature recited therein.

In particular, Applicants note that claims 49 and 50 have been amended to recite that the display to be performed on a way of shifting a display from a screen display in which the three-dimensional rotation body object is displayed at a time when the selection input is received by the selection input means, to a full-screen display which is a program execution screen of the program executed by the program execution means, is an animation display. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that when read in light of the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily be able to ascertain the meaning and scope of such language.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 49 and 50 are in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants kindly request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 49 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. (U.S. 5,515,486) in view of Hoarty (U.S. 5,485,197) and Ohkura et al. (U.S. 6,005,601).

Claims 49 and 50, as amended, each recite that the display to be performed on a way of shifting a display from a screen display in which the three-dimensional rotation body object is displayed at a time when the selection input is received by the selection input means, to a full-screen display which is a program execution screen of the program executed by the program execution means, is an animation display.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the Ohkura reference (U.S. 6,005,601) teaches the above-noted feature recited in claims 49 and 50. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Regarding Ohkura, Applicants note that this reference discloses the use of an electronic program guide which is divided into multiple areas (X, Y and Z) (see Fig. 5 and col. 5, lines 31-35). As pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action, in Ohkura, if a program is selected from the electronic program guide, and this program is currently being broadcast, then the picture on the monitor is switched from a display of the electronic program guide to a display of the selected program (see col. 11, lines 58-67).

Based on the foregoing description, Applicants respectfully submit that while Ohkura discloses the ability to shift from a display of an electronic program guide to a display of a selected program, that Ohkura does not disclose or in any way suggest that an animation display is performed on a way of shifting a screen display from the display of the electronic program guide to the display of the selected program.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Ohkura does not disclose or suggest that the display to be performed on a way of shifting a display from a screen display in which the three-dimensional rotation body object is displayed at a time when the selection input

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAR 22 2007**

is received by the selection input means, to a full-screen display which is a program execution screen of the program executed by the program execution means, is an animation display, as recited in amended claims 49 and 50. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Amro reference and the Hoarty reference fail to cure this deficiency of Ohkura.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in claims 49 and 50. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 49 and 50 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenjiro TSUDA et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields

Kenneth W. Fields

Registration No. 52,430

Attorney for Applicants

KWF/jiv  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
March 22, 2007